

**STATUS REPORT TO THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR SUBMITTED BY
THE PARTIES TO THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

The Parties to the Collaborative Agreement, the Plaintiff Class, represented by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Ohio; the City of Cincinnati (CPD) and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) (collectively referred to as “the Parties” or “the Collaborative Partners”) submit this status report to the Independent Monitor, pursuant to Collaborative Agreement, paragraph 105.

Reporting Period:
November 6, 2005 – February 5, 2006

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Community Problem Oriented Policing (Paragraph 29)
- III. Mutual Accountability Evaluation
- IV. Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement
- V. Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment
 - A. Data Collection and Analysis
 - B. Training and Dissemination of Information
 - C. Professional Conduct
- VI. Citizen Complaint Authority
- VII. Miscellaneous

Appendix

I. INTRODUCTION

This Report is intended to advise the Independent Monitor as to the progress that the Parties have made during the reporting period of November 6, 2005 through February 5, 2006. The Independent Monitor oversees implementation of both the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City and the United States Department of Justice, and the Collaborative Agreement (CA) between the City, the ACLU, and the FOP. The MOA is appended to the CA and is enforceable solely through the mechanism of paragraph 113 of the Collaborative Agreement

The purpose of the Collaborative Agreement is to resolve conflict, to improve community-police relations, to reduce crime and disorder, to fully resolve the pending claims of all individuals and organizations named in the underlying litigation, to implement the consensus goals identified by the community through the collaborative process, and to foster an atmosphere throughout the community of mutual respect and trust among community members, including the police. The Parties recognize that there has been friction between some members of both the community and the CPD. The ultimate goal of the Agreement is to reduce that friction and foster a safer community where mutual trust and respect are enhanced among citizens and police.

The end of 2005 into the beginning of 2006 was a significant time for Cincinnati. The city welcomed a new mayor accompanied by four new members to City Council, one of which is a former Cincinnati police officer. The Department itself welcomed a new FOP president, the first female officer to be elected to the position in the organization's history.

The CPD experienced a surge of support from City government and the community following a series of critical incidents involving police officers. During a six week period three officers had been shot including one partially caught on tape. Cincinnati residents had a first hand glimpse of the scene and sounds of police work. The community watched as the Police Chief explained the serious nature of what his officers endure every day and reiterated the importance of the community's participation in fighting crime in their neighborhoods.

The continued effort of police officers interacting with the community through CPOP has increased the level of trust between residents and the police. That trust will grow as the Department rolls out a

reorganization of neighborhood officers to include every member of the CPD. On February 12, 2006, the CPD redeployed the neighborhood units to various shifts in their respective districts. Implementation will not only reform police practice, but will enhance trust, communication, and cooperation between police and the community. The City of Cincinnati continues to be enthusiastic and committed to this endeavor.

This report provides updates based on the following established committees to fully address each area stipulated in the Agreement:

- Community Problem-Oriented Policing Committee
- Mutual Accountability
- Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement
- Fair, Equitable, and Courteous Treatment
- Citizen Complaint Authority Committee

II. COMMUNITY PROBLEM ORIENTED POLICING (PARAGRAPH 29)

Item 29(a). The City, in consultation with the other Parties, shall develop and implement a plan to coordinate City departments with the CPOP focus of the CPD.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor believes that the new, separate city service tracking system (CSR) is a benefit to police and citizen problem solvers, and the link that will be established between the revised CPOP tracking system and the CSR can facilitate interagency collaboration.

As we noted in prior Reports, the Monitor's assessment of compliance requires documentation of the City's implementation of its coordination plan. This can include the number of agencies involved, the range of City services provided, the number of projects with interagency cooperation (including the work of Neighborhood Code Enforcement Response Teams), and whether the intervention assisted in reducing the problem. To determine compliance, the Monitor will evaluate the information in the CPD's revised CPOP tracking system, which should be used to better track the involvement and effectiveness of inter-agency collaboration, including the number of agencies involved, the range of City services provided, the number of projects with interagency cooperation, and whether the intervention assisted in reducing the problem.

The Monitor finds that the City is in partial compliance.

Status Update

The City and CPD have made significant progress towards compliance during the past quarter. Mr. Terry Cosgrove from the City Solicitor's Office was reassigned to the City Manager's Office in order to better utilize his knowledge and expertise with regard to CPOP and city code enforcement. He now serves as the Legal Neighborhood Liaison between the City Manager's Office, Solicitor's Office and the Police Department. Mr. Cosgrove regularly attends CPOP, Resource Committee and Community meetings, discussing code enforcement and quality of life issues and solutions.

Recently the CPD restructured the District Neighborhood Officer program to integrate the responsibility of problem solving and Community interaction to all of the officers assigned to a district

rather than just a select few. This positive change also necessitated an evaluation of the Neighborhood Code Enforcement Response Teams (NCERT) that had been established within each Police District in April 2005. Mr. Cosgrove and the CPD are currently working to reestablish city-wide NCERT Teams, which will be made up of representatives from the Health Department, Buildings & Inspections, Fire Department and the specific Police District where the problem is located. The expected completion date for restructuring the program is April 1, 2006.

Another project combining the efforts of the CPD and Mr. Cosgrove is the establishment of the Neighborhood Quality of Life (NQOL) code. Lieutenant David Fink from the CPD Planning Section and Mr. Cosgrove are working to expand legal enforcement of specific quality of life codes. Traditionally, only representatives from specific City departments were authorized to enforce certain codes, such as building code violations, weeds and litter control, animal complaints and overcrowding in liquor establishments. The new NQOL code will allow the police to issue citations for approximately fifty civil codes rather than contacting another agency to either respond or investigate the issue. This empowerment will significantly decrease the “red tape” normally involved in making necessary changes and improvements to our neighborhoods.

See Appendix Item #18.

Item 29(b), the Parties shall develop and implement a system for regularly researching and making available to the public a comprehensive library of best practices in community problem-oriented policing.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment

The Monitor compliments the Parties for their collaboration on a comprehensive library. The CPOP library may be the most comprehensive web library on a police department website. With the work of the Parties and the Partnering Center in developing the virtual best practices library and making these publications available in hard copy through the Hamilton County Library, the Monitor finds the Parties to be in compliance with this paragraph. The Parties have been in compliance with this section for six consecutive quarters.

As we have noted in prior reports, section 29(b) is also related to sections 29 (c) and (d). We believe that compliance for 29(c) and

29(d) will require training within the CPD of some of the 29(b) best practices, as well as their use in crime reduction efforts. Towards that end, we recommend that the CPD broaden dissemination of the best practices library to all officers, not just CPOP officers (adding it to the CPD's website is one way to do this).

Status Update

In an effort to continue to identify successful community initiatives to improve safety and community/police relations, the Community Police Partnering Center has forwarded to the Parties for review and inclusion in the CPOP Library, the following publications of "best practices" from the U.S. Conference of Mayors:

Faith Based Initiatives: Improving Safety and Community/Police Relations

1. Boston's Operation Homefront Involves Police, Clergy in Helping At-Risk Youth

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best_practices/usmayor05/boston_BP.asp

2. Fort Worth Trains Ministers to Increase Public Safety

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/us_mayor_newspaper/documents/05_13_02/Fort_Worth_BP.asp

3. CITY OF ANAHEIM - Neighborhood Improvement Process

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best_practices/bp_volume_2/anaheim.htm

4. CITY OF HOUSTON, TX - Program: City-Wide "March On Crime" Parade

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best_practices/diversity_10_99/city_tx.html

5. CITY OF NORFOLK, VA - Police Assisted Community Enforcement, Spiritual Action for Empowerment (PACE SAFE)

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best_practices/diversity_10_99/police_va.html

6. CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA - Seven Parishes Collaborate in MetroVision Regional School-to-Career Partnership

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best_practices/bp98/06_1998_Connecting_People_To_Jobs!New_Orleans_LA.htm

8. CITY OF HOUSTON, TX - Program: Prejudice Awareness Summits (In Conjunction with the Jewish Women International

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best%5Fpractices/diversity_10_99/prejudice_tx.html

9. Oak Park's Gang Prevention/Intervention Program Demonstrates Its Effectiveness

http://www.usmayors.org/USCM/best_practices/bp99/best_practices_americas_promise_gang.htm

10. CITY OF FORT WORTH, TX - Ministers Against Crime (MAC)

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best_practices/diversity_10_99/ministers_tx.html

11. CITY OF LIMA - Study Circle

http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/best_practices/bp_volume_2/lima.htm

These publications focus on the critical role the faith-based community can and has often played in improving community safety and building bridges between all community sectors and the police. The Community Police Partnering Center and the Cincinnati Police Department have both expressed an interest in more fully engaging the faith-based community in community safety initiatives and these publications provide specific guidance on how this community sector can partner with police to address safety and other community concerns.

In addition to being added to the CPOP website, these publications and synopses of key initiatives are being provided to the Metropolitan Religious Coalition of Cincinnati and the Amos Project, two faith community collaboratives, in an effort to inform members of the many ways they can work with police and community members to improve safety and community/police relations.

During training conducted in December 2005 for CPD Lieutenants and above, members were reminded of the availability and accessibility of the "Best Practices" library.

Item 29(c). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop a process to document and disseminate problem-solving learning experiences throughout the Police Department and the public.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor applauds the training efforts made in 2005. It represents an increase in commitment to training around CPOP. We believe that the training undertaken in the last three quarters is a good first step towards introducing Department employees to CPOP, including non-sworn employees as well as new sworn supervisors. We believe the CA requires the CPD to prepare and schedule additional training opportunities for its employees, particularly officers not in COP units, to emphasize the CPD's commitment to CPOP as the principal policing strategy of the CPD, and train these officers in working on specific, documented crime, disorder, and safety problems beyond answering calls for service or handling cases. Expectations for involvement should be clear and ultimately supported by the performance appraisal system.

The FOP suggests a five minute video about CPOP so all officers receive consistent information about CPOP. The Monitor concurs with this suggestion. A short video can provide Chief Streicher an important vehicle for voicing commitment to addressing crime, disorder and other safety problems through problem-solving and sharing it with Department personnel as part of a larger training curriculum.

We recognize that training the entire Department is time-consuming given the size of the Department. We suggest the CPD begin planning for it, blocking off the training calendar and developing the training that will help CPD move from a special unit approach to CPOP to department-wide responsibility for tackling crime and other public safety problems through problem solving. While the CPD states that all officers received problem solving training in the Academy, and CPOP training during the 2005 in service training, in discussions with CPD personnel, there were some who did not recall having had problem solving training, and others who remembered some training only when they were in the Academy. Interest in engaging in problem solving appeared to flow from self-initiative: those who were interested in it looked at problems, including problem locations; others did not. We believe the CPD leadership should send a clear message about its expectations and accompany it with training around problem solving and the resources for supporting problem solving.

With respect to documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences in the field throughout the CPD, we stated in our October 2005 Monitor Report that the roll call bulletin is an excellent start, but it is not sufficient by itself to meet compliance. Last quarter we noted that since the bulletin will only be used one day, the CPD must quickly pick up the pace of documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences. This quarter, no additional roll call bulletins were used. Also, we stated that similar write-ups of other problem-solving efforts that have undergone some evaluation can be disseminated in other ways, for example through the Blue Wave, the Department's new newsletter, or in Staff Notes, which go out to all Department employees. If problem-solving efforts undertaken by the CPD have not yet been evaluated, then CPD can draw on problem-solving efforts from other departments and share them as a basis of discussion among officers and units about types of problem solving CPD employees can undertake. We hope that by the end of next quarter the CPD will disseminate several problem-solving write-ups.

As for public accessibility of problem-solving efforts, the CPD's problem solving descriptions remain accessible to the public via internet on the CPOP website. As mentioned earlier, the problem-solving descriptions contained in the CPOP website tracking system have migrated to the new system and some have been updated with additional details. The CPD is in compliance with the public dissemination requirement of this subsection.

Concerning the emphasis on problem solving throughout the CPD, some additional training has occurred and we hope to see a ramping up of the inclusion of CPOP in many more of the training sessions the CPD presents. The CA requires that problem solving be emphasized in Academy training, in service training and field officer training. Comprehensive training that shifts problem solving from a special unit responsibility to department-wide responsibility will put the CPD in compliance. To date, however, the CPD is not in compliance with this subsection requirement. The roll call training should supplement, but not supplant more intensive training that covers the fundamentals of problem solving and the role each person in the organization has in it and the types of accountability that will support the system.

In earlier Reports, we noted that 29(b), (c), and (d) are linked. These and other CA sections are meant as ways to facilitate the adoption of problem solving as the CPD's principal strategy to reduce crime and disorder in Cincinnati. We have found the Parties in compliance with the public dissemination requirements

under 29(b) and (c). However, because problem solving is to be adopted as the “principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems,” the portions of 29(c) and (d) that deal with training and dissemination within the Department require greater efforts, as they are meant as a way to effectuate significant change in the organization. We have determined that the City is in partial compliance with the requirements of 29(c) for training and dissemination to CPD members.

Currently, of the four subparts to this subparagraph, the Parties are in compliance with the public dissemination requirement. Progress on the other elements of this CA section is required. The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

The Police Academy has emphasized CPOP during one hour training sessions for all sworn and non-sworn personnel over the past year. This included expanding awareness and knowledge of the COP unit's role in the Department and the community. Specifically, the training reviewed the SARA model with examples revealing how the Department has incorporated the process into problem-solving efforts and educated personnel on access and utilization of the CPOP website.

The CPD continues to promote, educate, and make formal and informal presentations on CPOP. During this reporting period, the following CPD officers participated in CPTED training with community members and CPPC staff at RCPI:

- District 1: PO Chris Schroder and PO Doug Neack
- District 2: PO George Engleman and PO Alvin Triggs
- District 3: PO Scott Schaerer and PO Robin White
- District 4: PO Lou Arnold
- District 5: PO Jay Barnes and PO Darryl Chatman

Lt. Larry Powell conducted CPOP training for new supervisors on December 19, 2005. Non-sworn employees participated in this same presentation on November 14, 2005. CPOP continues to be a regular agenda item at monthly CPOP supervisors' meetings and is also discussed at the quarterly neighborhood officer round table training sessions. PowerPoint presentations were used for FTO Training, Management Training, City Council's Law and Public Safety Committee, Department Heads, and a presentation at the University of Cincinnati.

See Appendix Items #15 and #16 to view those slides.

The Police Academy is currently coordinating with the COP Coordinator on producing a five minute roll call training video which will emphasize the Department's commitment to CPOP as the principal policing strategy. The target date for completion of the video is June 1, 2006.

In December 2005, the CPD conducted an eight hour class, *Crime Analysis and the CPOP Tracking System*, for Lieutenants and above. The first two hours of the training was led by Lieutenant Colonels Janke and Whalen covering the level of expectation involved in crime analysis. Handouts included a breakdown of the crime analysis process and objectives; a summary of the elements of crime analysis (types, functions, process, requirements, sources of information, etc.) and an overview of the status of the CA. Copies of the handouts are included as Appendix Item # 1.

A member of the Cincinnati Area Geographic Systems (CAGIS) assisted the CPD to better explain the importance, benefits, and capabilities of the new SARA/CPOP application. Participants had hands-on training inside of the application as well as a general overview of the mapping tool that runs in conjunction with the application. While the CPD does not anticipate this particular group entering problems and activities, they will be responsible for monitoring and auditing the problem-solving efforts in their respective assignments.

The CPD's Community Oriented Coordinator rounded out the training by providing examples of problem-solving activities in other cities honored at the Problem Oriented Policing Conference. An overview of the most recent CPOP Annual Awards was also provided. The goal was to demonstrate how other agencies with similar problems worked with the community to achieve their problem solving goals while utilizing the SARA model. Finally, emphasis was placed on the importance of detailed problem solving reports. Attendees were given the *Critical Elements Which Must be Addressed in Quarterly Problem Solving Reports* to assist with reporting.

Item 29 (d), The Parties shall research best practices on successful and unsuccessful methods of problem-solving used by other professionals (e.g. conflict resolution, organizational development, epidemiology, military, civil engineering and business).

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Over the last several months we have seen improvements in the availability of research from which the CPD can devise countermeasures to crime. We noted in our June 2005 Report that the sharing of gun violence reduction strategies is an excellent start. We also hope that the revised CPOP tracking system will increase the use of crime reduction research, manuals and guides when police undertake a project. We believe the new system holds great promise. If officers identify more specifically the information that they reviewed and what they learned, we believe it will help the CPD to determine if training is needed in using problem-solving/best practice resources in reducing safety problems.

The OSCOR-generated reports from the University of Cincinnati are excellent research products. Five reports focus on drug markets. One of the five reports offers a citywide, comprehensive approach to drug market reduction, and the other four contain an analysis of seven separate drug markets within four Cincinnati neighborhoods. These drug market reports provide ample information to begin more strategic attacks on the markets and should be disseminated, if they have not been already, to District Commanders, Violent Crimes Task Force, Street Corner Narcotics, the Partnering Center, and CPOP teams for follow-up. The citywide OSCOR report lays out the "basic elements of successful approaches used in other cities:"

- long-term commitment
- measurable objectives
- comprehensive approaches
- accountability
- publicity
- on-going evaluations, and
- strategy maintenance

This framework shows that turning crime problems around requires intentional, planned, consistent efforts. The research reports contain the beginning analysis of these drug markets (specific analysis of the dealers and the buyers from arrest data was not available), along with information about the different types

of interventions that have had positive effects on markets (48 different interventions are listed).

The seven drug markets studied generated over 3,000 calls for service to police in 2004. Although each of the markets is different, patterns were identified across markets concerning: types of drugs; dates/times of market operation; territorial behavior among dealers; methods of communication between market players; demographics of dealers, lookouts, and buyers; access to arterial routes; and the presence of nearby convenience stores.

These reports offer highly specific research which the City can use to reduce drug markets.

In addition, the citywide report shows how a comprehensive approach to closing drug markets across Cincinnati is achievable. One of the recommendations made is that CPD identify how many drug markets there are in Cincinnati:

- How many open-air drug markets are currently operating in Cincinnati?
- What is the precise location of each market? (Multiple sources of data should be used to identify discrete markets. Potential sources of information are calls for service, narcotic arrest information, and resident surveys. After the markets are located, the following site specific questions should be asked to help develop responses)
- Who are the dealers/buyers and where do they live?
- What environmental features make this location attractive to dealers/buyers?
- What interventions have been or are currently being used to disrupt this drug market?
- Once identified, is there evidence to suggest that these interventions have or have not been successful?
- What other crimes that occur in this location are related to drug market activities (e.g., loitering, theft from vehicles, homicide)?

In discussions with CPD staff during our last Monitor visit, we heard widely different estimates of the number of open-air drug markets in Cincinnati. We believe that part of the adoption of problem-solving by the CPD is to use it to find out more about one of Cincinnati's major generators of crime and violence, its open-air drug markets. Some staff also suggested that the police should do sweeps at the drug markets and then the Partnering Center should come in and stabilize the area. This is unrealistic on several fronts.

Sweeps without analysis will not be enough of an intervention in entrenched markets to begin stabilization efforts. Drug markets require more sustained solutions from police departments than sweeps, and an analysis of a drug market, as shown in the OSCOR reports, provides the beginnings of what is needed to see which interventions are most suited to each market.

As we noted in the prior quarter's Report, the following developments would demonstrate compliance with 29(d): research is used in problem solving projects (see 29(b)); projects apply situational crime prevention if appropriate (the CA specifically mentions situational crime prevention); projects that are on POP Guide topics show awareness of the guide and its elements; research is used in crime reduction and traffic problem reduction efforts; best practice knowledge is used as a skills measure in the performance evaluations.

The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Status Update

Several units referenced POP Guides and Best Practices during this reporting period:

- Downtown Services Unit is currently addressing an aggressive panhandling problem at the corner of 5th Street and Central Avenue. A review of the U.S. Department of Justice Problem Oriented Guide, Volume 13, "Panhandling" offers many strategies for addressing this problem.
- The Major Offenders Unit within CIS modified Project DISARM to emulate Project Exile and Operation Ceasefire implemented in several states. Since then, Project DISARM has been used as a "best practices" model and emulated in Northern Kentucky and Dayton, Ohio.

The Major Offenders Unit is also involved with Project CRIMESTOPPERS which is modeled and governed by the bylaws of the Crime Stoppers International, Inc.

- The Financial Crime Squad utilized the Identity Theft Verification Passport Program available through the Ohio Attorney General.

Item 29(e). The Parties, consistent with the Community Partnering Program, shall conduct CPOP training for community groups, jointly promote CPOP and implement CPOP training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Partnering Center and the CPD participated in, helped with, or co hosted a number of trainings this quarter. The training provided around specific crime/disorder problems and tactics is an example of the creativity that problem solving can lead to when used regularly. We applaud the efforts underway and look forward to seeing additional training of this type, as well as continued progress in training community members in CPOP. These joint endeavors hold great potential for the success of the CA.

The Parties are in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

During this reporting period, Partnering Center Outreach Workers have coordinated or conducted seven (7) trainings, details of which are outlined below. Currently, CPPC Outreach Workers are actively engaged in 32 Cincinnati neighborhoods, supporting existing CPOP Teams in the application of the SARA Process, encouraging developing teams, or engaging new citizens to participate in SARA trainings or other crime and safety-related trainings and presentations.

As of February 5, 2006, the status of CPOP efforts in which the Partnering Center is involved is as follows:

- **Number of Active¹ CPOP Teams:** **15**

- **Number of Developing CPOP Teams:** **17**

¹ "Active" describes a team that has identified a problem as defined by the CPOP curriculum, and a Community Problem Solving Worksheet has been completed with input from community stakeholders, and CPD and CPPC staff. Additionally, a neighborhood can have more than one CPOP problem solving effort. For example, Over-the-Rhine has one Active CPOP Team & one Developing CPOP Team during this reporting period.

Partnering Center Senior Outreach Workers met during this reporting period and continue to meet with CPOP Coordinator Lt. Larry Powell and other CPD staff to review all of the CPOP cases on the City of Cincinnati Community Problem Oriented Policing website, determine which cases are being jointly facilitated by CPD and CPPC staff, and establish the accuracy of the CPOP Case information. This reconciliation of CPOP cases is vital as we begin 2006, and may become even more critically important in light of the CPD's recent restructuring of the Neighborhood Unit, since new CPD personnel may become involved with entering data into this website. The Partnering Center is committed to streamlining this process to ensure the accuracy and consistency of CPOP information that goes out to the public.

CPPC Training Highlights during this Reporting Period:

On November 22 and 23, the Community Police Partnering Center sponsored Part 2 of the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) training for all CPPC staff, ten CPD officers and nine citizens (Part 1 of this four-day training was held over two days in October, 2005 and was covered in the previous quarterly report). Tri-State Regional Community Policing Institute (RCPI) hosted the training at their facility. The training, presented by Gregory Saville and Anna Brassard of AlterNation, included field projects that utilized the application of CPTED principles to neighborhood crime and disorder locations. Two of these CPTED field projects have since become CPOP initiatives. One project from Madisonville, has since been presented to the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) Committee in that neighborhood, and is being included in a final draft of a funding request that will be submitted to HUD in March, 2006. This joint presentation was researched and developed by Madisonville resident Prencis Wilson, District 2 Officer Dwayne Dawson, and CPPC Outreach Worker Doreen Cudnik. See Appendix Item #2 to view the Madisonville CPTED presentation.

Also in November, CPPC Executive Director Richad Biehl and Senior Community Outreach Worker / Trainer, Amy Krings presented information about the Partnering Center, CPOP, and the Collaborative Agreement to 24 participants at Xavier University's Community Leadership Academy. This event included participants from the neighborhoods of Evanston and Norwood, and members of the Xavier University faculty and staff.

During December, Partnering Center Outreach Worker Valarie Brown Green organized a Court Watch Training for Senior Citizens

in Millvale. This training was designed so that seniors, who may be limited in their ability to travel, walk with Citizens on Patrol teams, etc., can remain updated about crime and safety-related information in their neighborhood and become involved in addressing open drug dealing in the Millvale Metropolitan Housing Community by using the internet. Subsequent “refresher” sessions were held to familiarize these seniors with using the Hamilton County Clerk of Courts website to track cases important to the Millvale community.

Outreach Worker Brown Green also coordinated a “Preparing For A Disaster” training in Millvale with the Cincinnati Chapter of the American Red Cross. This training presented information about establishing a plan for contacting family members in the event of an emergency, and other helpful information to increase citizens’ knowledge so that they can stay safe, protected and prepared should a disaster occur close to home.

Ms. Brown Green also coordinated a December Court Watch training with Terry Cosgrove of the City’s Law Department for residents of Mt. Airy.

In January, Partnering Center Senior Outreach Worker and Trainer Amy Krings presented training in Asset Mapping in Mt. Washington as part of that community’s Strategic Plan Development. At various meetings in this community since that training, which included a City Planning Department official and neighborhood stakeholders, it was agreed that safety would be a primary focus of their strategic plan. The CPPC Outreach Worker Intern assigned to this community, Dave Tobias, and Officer Kelly Macbeth are organizing a meeting of Mt. Washington landlords to provide them with information about how to deter crime in their apartment complexes and rental properties.

On February 2, Community Outreach Worker Intern Sarah Buffie and District 5 Officer Tammy Hussels trained 34 new stakeholders from the Clifton, University Heights and Fairview (CUF) neighborhoods in the SARA process. Outreach Worker Steven Baines also helped facilitate a discussion following the training, which included members of the Clifton Heights Improvement Association (CHIA), Citizens on Patrol, the West McMicken Improvement Association, and other community groups. The various groups will meet during the month of February to share information from the training with their members who could not attend, and discuss the formation of a new CPOP Team.

Senior Community Outreach Workers Amy Krings and Doreen Cudnik also began work on a brochure which will provide information about the diverse crime prevention and other trainings that the Partnering Center can provide to citizens. This brochure is scheduled to be completed in the 2nd Quarter of 2006, and will be disseminated to communities through Community Councils and other neighborhood groups.

In November 2005 through January 2006, Mr. Wendell France, former director of the Citizen Complaint Authority, and Mr. S. Gregory Baker, Executive Manager of the CPD Police Relations Unit, conducted a class covering the history of civilian overview in Cincinnati. The role of the CCA and the CCA's investigative process were also discussed. The presentation included information on the type of complaints most frequently received as well as how to minimize complaints. The presentation was part of Supervisor/Management training.

On December 12, 2005, Mr. Baker met with the League of Women Voters who hosted a discussion covering police community relations. He updated the audience on the implementation of the CA and the various activities that have occurred towards improving relations.

Item 29(f). The Parties shall coordinate efforts through the Community Partnership Program to establish an ongoing community dialogue and interaction including youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low-income residents and other City residents on the purposes and practices of CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA. Full compliance with this provision would entail a plan for structured dialogue, joint promotion of events and a review of the feedback from those events. It would also demonstrate compliance if the Parties scheduled follow-up meetings, and reported on the outcomes of the discussions and meetings, descriptions of areas of agreement and disagreement in the dialogue, and next steps.

Status Update

The Parties held a community forum on January 19, 2006 to discuss the results of the first annual report from the RAND

Corporation. This forum was presented to a number of invited community representatives from a broad cross-section of concerned citizens and organizations. RAND sent Terry Schell to summarize the results and answer questions regarding this first report. The event was facilitated by Dr. Jennifer Williams of J.E. Williams & Associates. The dialogue was spirited and informative. The Parties handed out feedback forms, the results of which demonstrate that more information should be disseminated about the work that RAND is doing and the CA in general.

During this reporting period, CPPC Outreach Worker staff, including the Executive Director, met with other participants of the University of Cincinnati Safety Initiative, "Neighborhood Connections". U.C. graduate students are preparing a neighborhood survey to determine citizens' perception of safety, experience of crime victimization, recommendations for improving neighborhood safety, and interest in engaging in neighborhood safety efforts. The survey will be administered by U.C. students. Analysis is being conducted to determine crime hot spots and hot times in the University Heights area using data related to juvenile and adult arrests and reported crime in the area.

Also during this reporting period, the Center's Executive Director and Outreach Worker Steven Baines (who also serves as the Chairman of the Hamilton County Board of Health) attended the second Hamilton County Gun Violence Prevention meeting at the Board of Health. This meeting was co-hosted by Community Action Agency and included a presentation by CPPC Executive Director Richard Biehl on Promising Strategies to Reduce Gun Violence. Additionally, meetings were held during this reporting period with Cincinnati business leaders to discuss potential support for a youth gun violence reduction initiative.

Senior Community Outreach Worker Doreen Cudnik assisted the East End community in the research and writing of a Safe & Clean Neighborhood Grant, which focuses on CCTV cameras at two hot spots along Kellogg Avenue. Officer Kathy Horn and Ms. Cudnik have since relayed information to the resident group about additional ways in which they can address persistent problems at these locations, while they await funding for the cameras. By offering additional problem solving resources, Officer Horn and Outreach Worker Cudnik hope to develop a CPOP team in this community in early 2006.

Outreach Worker Valarie Brown Green also assisted the Mt. Airy community with the research and writing of a Safe & Clean

Neighborhood Grant, which focuses on CCTV cameras for five hot spots in this community. Officer Amy Moore assisted in this effort.

The Partnering Center's Executive Director provided the keynote address to RCPI Police Academy graduates at their November ceremony. Mr. Biehl's address covered the traditional role of police to serve, honor, and protect as well as the current and future roles as community builders, problem solvers, and peace makers.

In December, the Executive Director along with Doreen Cudnik and Madeline Moxley met with Community Council presidents and Neighborhood Officers and a Sergeant from Walnut Hills and East Walnut Hills to discuss moving forward with a CPOP initiative at 2525 Victory Parkway (formerly the Alms Hotel – which was one of the field projects from the November CPTED training). The Walnut Hills community subsequently agreed to adopt this location as a CPOP initiative and will be seeking substantial support from the CPPC over the next couple of months.

Also in December, the Executive Director, Cassandra Robinson and Madeline Moxley met with Rev. Frank Carpenter and representatives St. Johns Unitarian Universalist Church (a Friend of the Collaborative) to discuss ways they can assist in this Walnut Hills / East Walnut Hills CPOP Initiative at 2525 Victory Parkway. They agreed to support this effort. CPPC's Executive Director addressed the entire St. John's U.U. congregation on February 5, and invited the congregants to support the Center's work, CPOP and the CA by participating in the following ways:

- Join an existing CPOP Team
- Participate in a CPOP event (door hangers, surveying, neighborhood clean-ups)
- Form a CPOP team
- Join/form a Citizens on Patrol group, Court Watch group, City Watcher
- Create a faith-based initiative (10 Point Coalition in Boston, Ministers Against Crime, etc.)
- Help get information to other citizens about how to join
- Join the Friends of the Collaborative or other organizations (Woman's City Club) who are seeking social justice by Supporting the Collaborative Agreement and engaging in other community building activities (Peter Block's "community engagement" forums)²

The Partnering Center continued their work during this reporting period with Jay Rothman and Meghan Clarke of the ARIA Group to discuss the outreach, survey and re-engagement of the 3,500 stakeholders of the Collaborative Process as a means of generating greater support of the Partnering Center, CPOP and the Collaborative Agreement.

On December 30th, the Executive Director attended a special meeting of Cincinnati City Council's Law & Public Safety Committee meeting which focused on a discussion of the death of a teen following a youth dance at the Legacy Banquet & Event Center. This meeting also included a broader discussion of youth gun violence throughout the city. Since this meeting, the Center's Executive Director has presented Law & Public Safety Committee Chair Cecil Thomas with information on Promising Strategies to Reduce Youth Gun Violence based upon research by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

CPPC & CPOP in the Media

The Partnering Center continued their outreach to the community during this reporting period by continuing their monthly "BUZZ on CPOP" radio show. The November show included representatives of the communities of Bond Hill, East Walnut Hills and Walnut Hills along with CPPC staff members.

In December, representatives of the communities of Kennedy Heights, North Avondale, and Downtown participated and discussed community safety initiatives. Also, representatives from Lighthouse Youth Services and Y.E.P. (Young Entrepreneurs Program) participated to discuss safety issues affecting youths.

The Partnering Center and neighborhood CPOP efforts were featured twice during the month of January, 2006. On January 7, WKRC-TV did a feature on their 6:00 PM newscast which featured an interview with CPPC executive director Rick Biehl, and Madisonville citizens Prencis Wilson and Julia Torrey discussing Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and how they are using this methodology to improve safety in that community. WXIX-TV's 10:00 PM broadcast, also on January 7, featured CPPC Senior Outreach Worker Amy Krings and Ben Pipkin of Kennedy Heights discussing their successful crime prevention efforts in that neighborhood.

The progress of the Parties and the Partnering Center towards improving police-community relations through CPOP was highlighted in an article headlined "Better Policing", which appeared in the February 1 – 7 edition of City Beat, Cincinnati's News and Alternative Weekly. Quotes from Prencis Wilson of the Madisonville CPOP Team appear in this story, which can be read in its' entirety at <http://www.citybeat.com/current/allthenews.shtml>

See Appendix Item #3 to view the article.

The City of Cincinnati, Invest in Neighborhoods Inc., and Community Building Institute sponsored the Fourth Annual Cincinnati Neighborhood Summit on February 4, 2006 at the Cintas Center, Xavier University. The schedule included several workshops including *Deterrents to Drug Activity* featuring representatives from Northside and Kennedy Heights, two Cincinnati neighborhoods who shared some of their most successful strategies; *Successful Use of Clean & Safe Funds*, a resource for neighborhoods looking to improve safety; and *Implementing Court Watch*, a way for members of the community to track offenders through the court system and have a say when sentences are issued.

Members of the CPD's command staff and the CPPC attended the Summit. One of the hot topics was the community's concern over the recent announcement that Neighborhood officers will be redeployed to the various shifts in their respective districts. An Assistant Chief who attended the event felt the Summit provided an excellent avenue for communication between police and residents to alleviate concerns and answer questions.

Item 29(g). The Parties shall establish an annual award recognizing CPOP efforts of citizens, police, and other public officials.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor Team attended the Awards Ceremony. The Parties all attended, including the Chief of Police, the President of the FOP, and dozens of CPD members. The Awards Ceremony was inspirational and showed the rewards of the Collaborative Agreement, fair and equitable treatment of all, crime reduction, and increased trust. The Parties are in compliance with this CA provision.

Status Update

The date of October 26th, 2006 has been established for The Second Annual Community Problem Oriented Policing (CPOP) Award Banquet to be held at the Cintas Center at Xavier University. The Community Police Partnering Center, the primary sponsor for the first banquet, will work with the CPOP Award Committee (on which all Parties have representation) to identify additional sponsors and help plan this year's event.

Item 29(h). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop and implement a system for consistently informing the public about police policies and procedures. In addition, the City will conduct a communications audit and develop and implement a plan for improved internal and external communications.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD's policies and procedures remain accessible and available to the public on the CPD's website, <http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/cpd>. The City is in compliance with this part of paragraph 29(h). There is also a link in the City's CPOP website (<http://cagisperm.hamilton-co.org/cpop/>) to the CPD's procedure manual. The link provides access to community members who are engaged with the police through CPOP involvement. We believe that this sends a signal to the Cincinnati public of an increased willingness to create more transparent police operations, which is essential to building trust in the community.

Concerning the second part of this CA section, the City conducted a communications audit and has developed a plan for improved communications based on the scope of services developed for the community relations coordinator. The CPD is in compliance with this CA provision.

Status Update

The CPD, in conjunction with Hollister, Trubow, & Associates and the NCCJ, continues its work on improving communications through various outlets. The Fall *Blue Wave* was distributed during this reporting period and included such topics as Taser usage, CPD Rotary Club honorees, and an officer profile. Scheduled release for the winter newsletter is February.

The *Report to the Community, Fall Edition* is available through the Department's website.

An additional candidate was interviewed for the Community Relations Coordinator position on November 3, 2005. However, that individual accepted another position with the City.

See Appendix Item #4 to view the minutes from meetings held in November, January, and February.

Item 29(i). The CPD will create and staff a Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City is in compliance with this CA requirement.

Status Update

The Police Relations Unit is staffed, effective, and fully operational.

Item 29(j). The Parties shall describe the current status of problem-solving throughout the CPD via an annual report. Each party shall provide details on what it has done in relating to its role in CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

This year's Annual Report documents the progress the Parties achieved individually and collaboratively. The efforts undertaken this year are the result of significant hard work. They reflect tremendous success and can be a source of inspiration for Cincinnatians. We believe that the Annual Report offers the citizens of Cincinnati proof that change is not only possible, but an effective way to increase the level of trust and crime reduction skills of both citizens and the police. The Parties are in compliance with 29(j).

Status Update

The 2005 Annual Report is available through the Department's website.

Item 29(k). The CPD Commanders shall prepare quarterly reports that detail problem-solving activities within the Districts. Reports shall identify specific problems and steps taken by the City and community toward their resolution. Reports shall identify obstacles faced and recommendations for the future. Reports should be available to the public through the Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The number of Unit Commander quarterly reports increased again this Quarter. The Unit Commander reports submitted were not part of the new CPOP tracking system. This may be because the new system is only loaded on COP computers at this point. These reports contain more detail than those in the CPOP tracking system. A number of the problem-solving reports were more descriptive of identified problems than prior quarterly write-ups, and we commend the Department for the improvement. We will continue to work with the CPD to improve the reporting.

We noted in prior Reports that compliance with this CA provision will be demonstrated more clearly when all of the District and Unit Commanders prepare quarterly reports. Also, the reports should reflect an increasing use and proficiency in problem solving in the unit; a greater reliance on analysis and less reliance on unevaluated efforts; and a wide range of tactics – civil, situational crime prevention, zoning, environmental, etc. The reports also should describe the Unit Commanders' actions and plans to involve the entire command in problem-solving and CPOP activities, rather than just the COP officers. We see the beginnings of this in the current Unit Commander Reports.

At the December 2005 All-Parties meeting, the CPD indicated that in addition to "address-specific" problem solving efforts, it is engaged in larger scale problem solving efforts, in particular, efforts in the Over-the-Rhine neighborhood. Problem-solving does not have size limitations. We encourage the CPD to write up crime/safety problems it has identified (large or small), the substantive analysis it has completed, the range of countermeasures identified and selected based on the analysis, and the assessment measures it will be using.

The CPD is in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

In December 2005, the CPD worked in conjunction with three members of the Monitoring team to create the template, *Critical Elements Which Must be Addressed in Quarterly Problem Solving Reports*. (See Appendix Item #5) The form was created for District and Unit Commanders to use as a uniform tool for reporting problem solving activities. Not all units have access to the new SARA/CPOP application and therefore are unable to input information into the system at this time.

CPOP cases and problem solving activities can be reviewed at the CPOP website, www.cagis.org/cpop (new address). Several projects and problem have been updated since our last reporting period.

Attached as Appendix Item #6 are reports from the following districts/units:

- District 1
 - Downtown Services Unit
- District 2
- District 3
- District 4
- District 5
- Central Vice Control Section
 - Street Corner Unit
- Criminal Investigations Section
 - Homicide Unit
 - Personal Crimes Unit
 - Major Offenders Unit
 - Financial Crimes
- Special Services Section
 - Traffic Unit
 - Youth Services Unit
 - Park Unit

Item 29(l). The Parties shall review existing Police Academy courses and recommend new ones in order to effectively and accurately inform police recruits, officers, and supervisors about the urban environment in which they work.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

For compliance with this CA provision, we look for the Parties to review and consult on curricula and for the FOP, Plaintiffs to make recommendations on training and the CPD to consider and respond to those recommendations. Given the FOP's training recommendations and the Plaintiffs attendance at Academy training, the Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

The Police Academy has expanded the training committee to include a representative from Inspections Section, Internal Investigations Section, and Personnel Section in addition to the representative from the FOP to become more inclusive and have a diverse range of training ideas.

The Plaintiffs attended various training sessions throughout late fall and early winter (2005 – 2006) and make the following recommendations to some combination of the currently offered classes (verbal judo, stops and approaches, cultural differences, and/or in-service training):

- Add a component in which specific training occurs with respect to African Americans and their communication style and urban experience. The Plaintiffs do not recommend any stand alone training regarding such communication as we believe officers will neither take this seriously nor get much out of it.

This training should be developed as a coordinated effort between the CPD, community representatives chosen by the Plaintiffs, consultants, and academics.

There is a class offered by Northern Kentucky University professor, Dr. Michael Washington, called "Undoing Racism". The Plaintiffs believe this training could possess valuable and useful material

- The Plaintiffs also recommend working with Dr. Jennifer Williams and Dr. Robin Engel from the University of Cincinnati to develop content specifically targeted for the CPD. The class (or training) would focus on helping officers communicate within a context in which African Americans who are stopped are quick to feel disrespected and distrustful of the police. It would be scenario-based and, as stated above, would be inserted into already existing training so as not to marginalize it in the opinions of the officers being trained.

Item 29(m). The Parties, in conjunction with the Monitor, shall develop and implement a problem-tracking system.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Improvements to the problem-tracking system are a significant advance. The Community Relations Unit and CAGIS have worked very hard to revamp the system and offer officers, the Partnering Center, CPOP members, and citizens a more advanced and easy to maneuver system.

We are hopeful that the CPD will work diligently with CPD supervisors so they can mentor their officers in using the system effectively. Doing so will add precision to the problem-solving projects and help advance the Department's knowledge base about problem locations. With any new system there may be hiccups initially, and in fact the officers using the system may need additional mentoring and coaching during the first few months of its operation. We mentioned previously that we believe that the system, like any new information system, will only be as good as the information inputted. We believe that the CPD is committed to doing what is necessary to make the system a success. We offer our assistance if desired.

While some aspects of the system were not yet operational at the time the Monitor previewed it (call for service access, access to crime reports, arrest information, mug shot access, and FI information), CAGIS intends "progressive functionality." In other words, different data sets will come on-line inside the system over time. Access to calls for service, crime reports, arrest information, mug shots, and FI information is expected to come on line within the system by the end of next quarter. Use of these new databases within the tracking system will also require training.

Based on a review of recent projects in the tracking system, we already notice an improved level of information among the CPOP projects entered, due to greater use of the free-form entry blocks that query officers to “provide specifics.” Although some of the CPOP projects still require basic information, we are hoping that this is part of the initial hiccup we noted above and we believe the CRU will resolve this quickly. We hope that each CPOP report will contain call for service, crime data, and other information, as well as some evidence of analysis of the information. The fruits of problem solving – the ability to identify a longer term, more precise solution to a crime/safety problem -- are only enjoyed if analysis is done. We see the descriptions of the call for service information in the projects as very weak. We believe this can be easily corrected. The Monitor team sent the CRU an excerpt from one of the OSCOR reports (described in 29(d)) to show the type of sorting one can do with call for service information for a specific location.

Because the system has just been put in place, the Monitor will defer our compliance determination, but we are very hopeful about this new development.

Status Update

While improvements and updates to the CPOP/SARA are still in progress, cases are being added (14 new this quarter) and edited/updated.

All CPD personnel were reminded of the availability of the CPOP website via a Staff Note issued November 1, 2005. (Appendix Item #7)

Item 29(n). The City shall periodically review staffing in light of CPOP.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment

First, we will address the issue of crime analysis, second we will discuss the staffing issue in light of the strategic plan.

As we noted in our last Report, the crime analyst profession is quickly coming into its own. The CPD has chosen sworn personnel and is now training them in the basics of crime analysis. We believe that the hiring and training of additional crime analysts is an important step in moving towards a more information-driven department.

The CA requirement of a staffing review in light of CPOP requires an analysis of current organization capabilities beyond just the addition of crime analysts, however. It requires an assessment of the Department's organization in light of the adoption of problem solving as the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems. The Monitor recognizes that Chief Streicher has initiated a new five-year strategic planning process. The CA outlines the Department's organizational direction and should be a foundation for any new five year strategic plan. We also note that the development and implementation of a strategic plan is time consuming and requires a tremendous amount of organizational energy. The CPD should ensure that any plan supports and accelerates the move towards CA compliance so the CPD can fulfill its already defined responsibilities under the CA, which form the basis for both impacting crime and establishing trust between Cincinnati residents and the police. The Monitor looks forward to seeing a draft of the strategic plan. We believe that the strategic plan is a good place to affirm CPD's commitment to the CA and can be used to more quickly operationalize the CA.

As we noted above, much more in-depth reviews of staffing will be required to satisfy this section, but the increase in crime analysts places the CPD in partial compliance with this subparagraph of the CA.

Status Update

At the beginning of this report, the CPD alluded to the merge of the Department's neighborhood units with patrol effective February 12, 2006. This major staffing and reorganization of the department incorporates CPOP into all police operations. Every district and unit will have a CPOP Coordinating Supervisor while every shift will have a CPOP Sergeant. Each neighborhood/beat will now have three CPOP officers, one for every shift, versus just one neighborhood officer. The new neighborhood officers will be responsible for participating in community meetings in their respective beats only to provide citizens with the same familiarity among three officers that they experienced with their previous neighborhood officer. The department is excited to offer Cincinnati residents a contact officer for every hour of every day for every community concern.

See Appendix Item #8 to view the contact list for CPOP supervisors and officers for every district.

See Appendix Item #19 to view Districts 2 through 5's proposed workflow processes for successful implementation of department-wide CPOP integration.

Item 29(o). The City shall review and, where necessary, revise police departmental policies and procedures, organizational plans, job descriptions, and performance evaluation standards, consistent with its commitment to CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

In late October, the Monitor Team met with the Planning Unit Captain who oversees the PIT team. While attending management class at the Southern Police Institute, the Captain looked into aspects of performance appraisal systems, giving him a head start on the subject. We look forward to seeing early drafts of an appraisal. We recommend that they also be shared with the Plaintiffs. This will reduce the risk of adopting a revised performance evaluation system that is inadequate by CA standards.

In earlier Reports, we noted that the performance evaluations the CPD adopted in 2004 were not adequate for compliance under this section. The CPD recognizes that its evaluation system is outdated. We have also stated in our prior Reports that the performance appraisal system should be consistent with the CA and MOA, it should support problem solving, reflect that problem solving is the principal strategy of the Department, and be a means of accountability within the Department. We believe it is important that the PIT team members familiarize themselves with problem-oriented policing, the problem-oriented policing guidebooks, information about problem solving from the Center for Problem-Oriented Policing website, and the problem solving projects contained in CPD's CPOP tracking system. This will assist the Team in drafting a performance appraisal system that reflects the central place of problem solving as the CPD's approach to tackling crime and other safety problems.

The CPD will also need to revise its job descriptions in light of CPOP. Clearly, this is the case for patrol officer job descriptions, but job descriptions will also be needed for police specialists, investigators, FTOs, sergeants, FTO sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and lieutenant colonels. Revising job descriptions allows a police organization the opportunity to redefine its approach and what is expected of its employees, as well as the type of skills it

seeks for different positions. It even helps clarify the types of skills sought through recruitment. If problem solving is central to how the CPD will police, then it is these skills and evidence of their use (among other things) that will be reflected in selected people who should be promoted or assigned to special assignments.

The City appears to be making progress, but is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

- *Revision of department policies and/or procedures*

In November 2005, a Department Staff Note (Appendix Item #9) was published requiring the following sections/units to provide a quarterly problem solving report to the Police Chief (in addition to the five districts):

- Central Vice Control Section
 - Vice Section
 - Street Corner Unit
- Criminal Investigations Section
 - Financial Crimes Unit
 - Homicide Unit
 - Major Offenders Unit
 - Personal Crimes Unit
- Special Services Section
 - Park Unit
 - Traffic Unit
 - Youth Services Unit

Revisions to the Problem-Solving Procedure were made and due for release at the end of February. Changes were necessary in conjunction with the new reporting requirements and the redeployment.

- *Review or revision of organizational plans*

The Five-Year Strategic Planning Committee met on February 3, 2006 with the five bureau commanders to discuss strategic goals, objectives, strategies, and measurements for inclusion into the updated strategic plan. The approved strategic directions are: public safety, community partnerships,

personnel development, resource management, and technological advancements. Planning Section is currently drafting and editing the final strategic planning document to be discussed at the upcoming Leadership Retreat, February 22 and 23, 2006. The anticipated completion date for this project is early March 2006.

- *Review or revision of job descriptions*

Job descriptions were updated in November 2004 requiring a strong commitment to CPOP and the use of the SARA model of problem-solving in every area of police operations and specific positions. As mentioned earlier, the Police Chief directed the integration of CPOP into all police operations through the redeployment of the neighborhood units. This should satisfy the CA requirement to review and update job descriptions to reflect the police department's commitment to CPOP, specifically:

- Shall have a working knowledge of Community Problem Oriented Policing (CPPOP)
- Shall have a broad understanding of the SARA problem-solving methodology for consistent application in CPOP.
- Shall support CPOP initiatives to maintain a positive relationship between the Police Department, community members, and CPOP participants.
- Shall be active in CPOP teams, committees, and other groups formed for the purpose of identifying problems and/or solutions to problems within the community, City, or Department.
- Shall keep their supervisor informed of current CPOP issues.

See Appendix Item # 10 to view the job description for Uniform Patrol Officer/Specialist.

- *Review/Revision of performance evaluations*

In January 2006, the Police Chief reviewed a comprehensive update about the progress of the Annual Performance Evaluation project. The Police Chief has asked this PIT team to continue their effort. The Planning Section Commander has been in touch with the Independent Monitors and is awaiting some valuable information to proceed with this important project. The complexity of this project has been realized, so the Planning Section hopes to complete this project some time this year. It will be important to plan for supervisor and employee training of a revised annual performance evaluation. This project is scheduled for completion by mid-2006, training of supervisors in the third quarter of 2006, with implementation by January 2007.

Item 29(p). The City shall design a system that will permit the retrieval and linkage of certain information including repeat offenders, repeat victims, and/or locations.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The new system the CPD has selected is expected to be capable of retrieving and linking information in the CPD's current computer information systems to enable the CPD to track repeat offenders, repeat victims, and repeat locations for use in problem solving, CPOP cases, District/Unit Commander reports, Planning and Analysis Reports, and Crime Analysis Unit reports. The system will increase the CPD's ability to identify trends and patterns and use them to undertake problem-solving efforts. While the CPD's current information systems provide some information, they are systems that are based on old models of policing, where incidents were documented typically as isolated or non-recurrent events, where pattern analysis might focus on an offender "m.o.," rather than also on repeat location, repeat location types, repeat victim, and repeat victimization locations. The CPD is not using its current system to this capacity and is not sufficiently using its systems to spur problem solving or better inform problem-solving efforts; the CA calls for systems that can do these things.

The City is not in compliance with this CA provision.

Status Update

Information Technology Management Section has developed three databases to assist in the identification of community based problems. The databases provide specific information for use in problem analysis, response and assessment related to the following:

Repeat Locations

The search parameters will include the following for the previous quarter of the calendar year.

- Computer Aided Dispatch Incident Number
- Specific address information for locations with more than five incidents
- Incident time
- Complainant information, if known
- Complaint type
- Suspect information
- Disposition

Repeat Victimization

The search parameters will include the following for the previous six months:

- Victims of crime in three or more incidents
- Offense type
- Address of the offense
- Incident time
- Suspect / arrest information

Repeat Offender

The search parameters will include the following for the previous twelve month period:

- Individuals arrested more than five times
- Arrest charge information
- Specific address information for locations
- Incident time
- Complainant information

ITMS will publish the electronic databases in the Crime Analyst folder on the H-drive, accessible in-house only, under the heading of “Statistical Information” by the tenth day of January, April, July, and October.

Examples of data categorized by repeat calls for service, repeat victim, and repeat offender is included as Appendix Item #11.

In reference to the Monitor’s assessment:

“While the CPD’s current information systems provide some information, they are systems that are based on old models of policing, where incidents were documented typically as isolated or non-recurrent events, where pattern analysis might focus on an offender “m.o.,” rather than also on repeat location, repeat location types, repeat victim, and repeat victimization locations. The CPD is not using its current system to this capacity and is not sufficiently using its systems to spur problem solving or better inform problem-solving efforts; the CA calls for systems that can do these things.”

Paragraph 29 (p) requires the CPD to “design a system that will permit the retrieval and linkage of certain information [...]” The creation of the new databases fulfills this requirement.

Item 29(q). The City shall secure appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to detect, analyze and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment

Last quarter, the Monitor noted that we had not found sufficient evidence of analysis in the projects the CPD has submitted thus far to find the CPD in compliance. In only a few projects is there mention of the number of calls for service at a location and the projects do not include an analysis of the calls and what they suggest about the problem. Many of the problems that CPD is now undertaking in the community likely have been problems for years, repeat locations that are only recently being worked in a fashion that is somewhat different from an incident-driven response.

The CPD, as noted in the prior section, expects the CAD portion of the new system to be on line in 12 to 15 months and the RMS

portion of the integrated system to be on line in approximately 18 months (with some modules up earlier). The CPD cites its use of its current systems, and the fact that the new CPOP tracking system is now on-line, as a basis for a determination of compliance. While CPD's revised tracking system is now in place, CAGIS indicates an incremental roll out of program capabilities. This "progressive functionality" for the problem tracking system suggests that the full use of the system may take some time. As well, a tracking system for individual projects does not meet the language in 29(q): "appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to detect, analyze and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness." Paragraph 29(q) will be satisfied by an RMS/CAD system that is designed, programmed, and used to identify (detect) patterns and ease analysis and assessment of problems, whether citywide or location specific. At this point, CPD has reached a tentative contract with Motorola to develop and install a system. Installation of the system is more than a year away and use of the system as a tool in detecting, analyzing, and assessing problems will take longer than that.

The City is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

The Monitor reported, "We had not found sufficient evidence of analysis in the projects the CPD has submitted thus far to find the CPD in compliance." While the CPD recognizes more analysis is necessary, this assessment should fall under Paragraph 29 (k) rather than this section. As the Monitor noted, Motorola has been selected to meet this requirement. Technology has been secured and the CPD reiterates the progress that has been made in this effort that demonstrates partial compliance.

Additionally, the CPD respectfully requests consistency when determining compliance for both the MOA and the CA. While the CPD was in the development stage of its Employee Tracking System the Monitor recognized the progress that had been made towards full implementation and awarded.

"There has been a great deal of progress toward implementation of the ETS system. The CPD is now in compliance with the MOA requirements for the ETS protocol and data input plan. The Monitor will assess the CPD's use of the ETS system and implementation of the requirements

of the ETS protocol as the system becomes operational in the next quarter.”³

The CPD believes that the progress made towards this section’s requirement fits the same standard used to assess Paragraph 57 of the MOA.

³ Green, S.A. and Jerome, R.B (2004, July) *City of Cincinnati Independent Monitor’s Sixth Quarterly Report*, p. 38.

III. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY EVALUATION

Evaluation Protocol

Items 30-46, Evaluation Protocol

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CA provisions call for a comprehensive approach to evaluation that is broader than efforts in most other cities. We believe that the efforts undertaken in this first year of the Evaluation Protocol and the results of RAND's research has provided valuable information and lessons learned, that now need to be used to improve police-community relations and advance the goals of the Collaborative Agreement. We are convinced that the results of the Year One Evaluation Report reinforce and validate the CA's approach that problem solving must be the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder in Cincinnati.

The Parties are in compliance with the CA provisions requiring the development of a system of evaluation, and a protocol for accomplishing this evaluation (CA¶31-34). Now that the components of the Evaluation Protocol have been completed, and the RAND report has been published, the Parties are in compliance with implementation and with the requirement of public reporting of the results of the Evaluation Protocol (CA¶35-43). With the publication of RAND's first report, the Parties have a strong basis for assessing whether the CA goals are being accomplished, and have a benchmark to measure progress in 2006.

What the CA now requires is that the Parties meet with the Monitor "to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in the Agreement or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results," as required under CA ¶30. Paragraph 46 of the CA also states that "measurement of the success of the mutual accountability process" will be based on whether the evaluation data was "fully and fairly used to assess progress toward attaining the goals" of the CA, and whether the data was used "to adjust City, police and community strategies to address problems, reduce police and citizen use of force and improve police/community interaction."

In the RAND Report, the Monitor set out several recommendations for actions that the Parties and the Cincinnati community should take. One area that has a significant prospect for improvement in police-citizen relations is communications in traffic stop encounters. As RAND states, “[s]ubstantial improvements are possible if both police and community members make the effort [p. 108].” The Monitor also seconded RAND’s call for a larger dialogue about how black neighborhoods are policed. This would include discussions regarding incorporating problem solving and CPOP into hot spot/crime sweep efforts, and an examination of how and where arrests are being made and how they correlate to reported crime. Aggressive traffic enforcement may engender greater distrust, and may not be effective in reducing crime or improving traffic safety.

The RAND citizen survey demonstrates the wide gap in perceptions between whites and blacks in Cincinnati that must be addressed. These gaps must be reduced in future years for the CA to be successful and its goals to be achieved. The RAND report, particularly the traffic stop and video analysis, suggests that the principal problem is not officer-bias and the attitudes of individual police officers. It is instead the impact on the black community of decisions about police strategy. The right police strategy is one that effectively reduces crime, makes people feel safer, and reduces perceptions of police unfairness and bias. As noted by RAND, police research has shown that proactive policing can create frustration and distrust of the police, and its effectiveness is questionable. This is why the CA emphasizes problem solving and problem-oriented policing. Research shows that CPOP is effective policing.

Status Update

The Parties hosted a community forum on January 19, 2006, to discuss the RAND study and gather input from those in attendance. Additionally, the Police Command staff was briefed on the findings. The parties will meet to discuss the results of these two briefings to determine any further action.

See Appendix Item #14 to view the agenda for the Community Forum.

The RAND report is available through the CPD’s website at http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/police/downloads/police_pdf12746.pdf .

IV. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Collaborative Items 47-49

Pointing Firearms Complaints

The investigations of complaints of improper pointing of firearms from March 2000 to November 2002 were forwarded to the Conciliator, Judge Michael Merz, in July 2003. The Parties also submitted supplementary materials to Judge Merz for his review in making his decision under Paragraph 48. On November 14, 2003, Judge Merz issued his decision. Judge Merz determined that there has not been a pattern of improper pointing of firearms by CPD officers. Therefore, CPD officers will not be required to complete a report when they point their weapon at a person. The Parties are in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 48.

V. FAIR, EQUITABLE AND COURTEOUS TREATMENT

Collaborative Items 50-54. The CA requires the Parties to collaborate in ensuring fair, equitable and courteous treatment for all, and the implementation of bias-free policing. Data collection and analysis are pivotal to tracking compliance, and training is essential to inculcate bias-free policing throughout the ranks of the CPD. The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, is required to include detailed information regarding bias-free policing in all public reports. The collection and analysis of data to allow reporting on bias-free policing is to be part of an Evaluation Protocol developed with the advice of expert consultants.

A. Data Collection and Analysis

Monitor's Previous Assessment

a. Traffic Stop Data Collection

The CPD is collecting traffic stop data on Contact Cards, which are now being used by RAND for analysis. The CPD has implemented steps to address concerns raised by the RAND report regarding documentation of traffic stops, including the completion of information on the contact cards. The CPD will be in compliance with these CA requirements if the 2005 data shows a significant improvement in contact card completion. The Monitor will defer our compliance determination until the next quarter.

b. Data Collection on Pedestrian Stops

The Parties are not in compliance with this requirement.

c. Use of Force Racial Data

The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

d. Favorable Interactions

The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

e. Unfavorable Interactions

The Parties have developed a protocol for reporting unfavorable interaction by CPD officers with citizens. The protocol has been approved and entered by the Court as “Protective Order Re: Mutual Accountability Reports of Unfavorable Conduct by Citizens During Implementation of the Collaborative Agreement.” Mutual Accountability Forms have been developed and will be made available at all police districts and units of assignment. The Parties will be in compliance with this CA requirement when these forms are available for completion and then collected. The Parties are not in compliance with this provision.

Status Update

See Appendix Item #17 to view the City Manager’s memo regarding the release of RAND’s first year report.

B. Training and Dissemination of Information

Monitor’s Previous Assessment

The CPD reports efforts to learn of additional training programs on biasfree policing and to enhance its current training program. We hope that in the next quarter, the Plaintiffs and the FOP can join in this effort. The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Status Update

The Police Academy is currently in the process of producing a five-minute training video on the topic of professional traffic stops and bias-free policing. The video will be shown to all sworn personnel. In addition, the Police Academy is currently in the process of developing a training course that will review the recent RAND report and teach strategies to assist officers when approaching and communicating with citizens who are different from themselves in regard to race or ethnicity. Customer service principles will also be reviewed as part of this training.

The FOP attorney attended the four-hour Bias-Free policing training for police recruits held February 23, 2006. The training emphasized the manner in which police officers should conduct themselves during traffic stops of motorists. The FOP wishes to emphasize that in order to achieve the mutual accountability goals of the CA, police officers and recruits are not the only persons who should be receiving training relating to proper conduct during traffic stops.

The RAND report provides substantial support for the need to expedite the development of a plan by the Parties to the CA, in conjunction with the CPPC, to prepare and disseminate training modules and public service announcements for presentation to the entire community, through the schools, churches, community councils, CitiCable, and the media. This endeavor would encourage respectful and bias-free conduct and dialogue on the part of citizens during traffic stops and other policing efforts. If there is a concentrated effort to present such training to the citizens of this community, it will reinforce the mutual accountability requirement of the CA.

C. Professional Conduct

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD has put policies and procedures in place in compliance with this CA provision. However, the RAND report does identify concerns with cross-racial communications between officers and drivers that could be improved by additional training.

VI. CITIZEN COMPLAINT AUTHORITY

Collaborative Items 55-89

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Now that the CCA and the CPD have developed written procedures for the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of the CCA and the CPD investigations, the City is in compliance with CA paragraph 74. Also, with these procedures in place, it appears that the City is in compliance with paragraph 70, requiring that each complaint be directed to the CCA in a timely manner. As reported by the CCA, the City is also now in compliance with CA paragraph 71, requiring that the CPD not interfere with the ability of the CCA to monitor the work of the CPD at the scene, and monitor CPD interviews.

The coordination of the CCA and IIS procedures, and the new SOP setting out procedures for CPD action in those cases where the CCA sustains complaints has also put the City in a position to comply with CA paragraph 78, requiring that the City Manager and the Chief of Police refrain from making a final decision on discipline until after receipt of the CCA investigation and report. It appears that the City is in compliance with this provision, although there are several complaint investigations which are still awaiting a decision from the CPD or the City Manager.

Status Update

In January, the CCA Interim Director and members of CPD's command staff met with the City Manager and discussed this issue. A meeting protocol was established wherein we will meet with the City Manager the Thursday after the CCA board meeting which occurs on the first Monday of each month. This will ensure compliance with the MOA requirement that the City Manager take appropriate action 30 days after CCA concludes its cases.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS

- a. Message from the City Manager ref: **CPOP Implementation and Personnel Distribution** (Appendix Item #12)
- b. Article: **'Bumps' on bridge deter drug dealers**, *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, Nov. 13, 2005. (Appendix Item #13)
- c. Article: **Show of support for police**, *The Cincinnati Post*, Jan. 18, 2006. (Appendix Item #13)

APPENDIX

1. Crime Analysis and the CPOP Tracking Solution - Handout
2. CPTED Training PowerPoint
3. *City Beat* article, "Better Policing"
4. Internal Communications Council Minutes (November, December, January)
5. Form: *Critical Elements Which Must be Addressed in the Quarterly Problem Solving Report*
6. Quarterly Problem Solving Reports
7. Staff Notes Entry: **CPOP Website**
8. CPD Neighborhood Contacts
9. Staff Notes Entry: **Quarterly Problem Solving Reports**
10. Uniform Patrol Officer Job Description (11/04)
11. PowerPoint: Enhancing Information Management and Technology – Crime Information Database
12. Memo: **CPOP Implementation and Personnel Distribution**
13. *The Enquirer* Article: "Bumps on bridge deter drug dealers"
14. Agenda for the January 19, 2006 Community Forum
15. PowerPoint: CPOP Training
16. PowerPoint: Additional CPOP Training
17. Memo: **Release of RAND First Year Report**
18. Review Draft: **Neighborhood Quality of Life Unified Code**
19. Workflow proposals from Districts 2 through 5 for successful Department wide CPOP integration